DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 883 PS 017 524

AUTHOR Austin, Ann M. Berghout; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of Helping, Sharing, Comforting, Honesty, and Civic Awareness for Home Care, Day Care, and Preschool Children.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Awareness; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Family Environment; Moral Values; Outcomes of Education; *Preschool Children; *Problem Solving; *Prosocial Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Honesty; Sharing Behavior

ABSTRACT

In a study designed to determine whether experience in day care or preschool affects children's knowledge and enactment of prosocial behaviors, 59 children in day care, preschool, and home care were pre- and post-tested concerning: (1) their understanding of helping, sharing, comforting, honesty, and civic awareness; (2) their definitions of helping, sharing, comforting, and honest behaviors; and (3) their judgment of what their behavior would be in helping, sharing, comforting, or honesty dilemmas. Scores did not differ between groups for any dependent variable other than civic awareness. Preschool children scored higher than day care or home care children on civic awareness. Civic awareness scores were divided into awareness of national symbols, government figures, historical figures, religious figures, and Star Wars and cartoon characters. Preschool children scored higher on awareness in all categories except Star Wars and cartoon characters, for which the three groups did not differ. Data indicated that: (1) participation in a high quality child program expands a child's awareness of the world; (2) knowledge of cartoon and film figures appears to be part of the culture of childhood and is held by most children; (3) alternative and supplemental childrearing experiences do not necessarily affect children's prosocial values and notions of honesty. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297883

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Comparison of Helping, Sharing, Comforting, Honesty, and Civic Awareness for Home Care, Day Care, and Preschool Children

Ann M. Berghout Austin
Department of Family and Human Development
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322-2905
Jay D. Schvaneveldt
Department of Family and Human Development
Utah State University
Shelley L. Knudsen Lindauer
Department of Family and Human Development
Utah State University
Marcia Summers
Utah State University
Todd Braeger
Utah State University
Cheryl Robinson
Utah State University
Carol Armga
Utah State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann Berghout Austin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 021824

Running head: COMPARISON OF HELPING

Abstract

Fifty-nine children, including eighteen children (ten girls and eight boys) just entering preschool, nineteen children (eight girls and eleven boys) just entering or reentering day care, and twenty-two children (ten girls and twelve boys) in home care were asked to give their solutions to helping, sharing, comforting, and honesty dilemmas. They were also tested on civic awareness. All three subsamples were then retested three months later. Scores did not differ between groups for any of the dependent variables but civic awareness. Preschool children scored higher on civic awareness than day care or home care children. Civic awareness scores were divided into awareness of national symbols, government figures, historical figures, religious figures, and Star Wars and cartoon characters. Preschool children scored higher on awareness in all categories except for Star Wars and cartoon characters. The three groups of children did not differ on their ability to identify figures from Star Wars and from TV cartoon shows.

A Comparison of Helping, Sharing, Comforting, Honesty, and Civic Awareness for Home Care, Day Care, and Preschool Children

According to Rheingold (1982) many children demonstrate prosocial behaviors even as toddlers; as youngsters get older observable prosocial behaviors become more frequent. Developmentally, Peterson (1982) has suggested that prosocial growth occurs as the child, through increased social experience and concomitant cognitive growth, progressively modifies and revises internal rules for altruistic behavior. Utilizing Rheingold's theory that young children show measurable altruistic behaviors from toddlerhood and Peterson's model, specifically as it emphasizes the role of social experience, this study sought to determine if experience in a day care or preschool significantly affects children's knowledge and demonstration of the prosocial behaviors of helping, sharing, and comforting.

In addition to the prosocial variables described above, children's responses to several honesty dilemmas were also assessed as well as their general civic awareness. Civic awareness was defined as children's ability to recognize national symbols (such as the American Flag, government leaders), historical figures (such as George Washington), religious figures (for example, Pope John Paul II), and fictional characters (for example, Spiderman).

Clarke-Stewart and Fein (1983) have emphasized the expanded

social behaviors day care and preschool children (program children) seem to display, suggesting that program children are more socially mature than children reared exclusively at home. According to Clarke-Stewart and Fein (1983), program children score higher than home care children on measures of cooperation, friendliness, responsiveness, and social confidence. Nonetheless, these authors and others (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978) note that program children may also show heightened social behaviors in negative ways, with day care and preschool children scoring less polite, agreeable, compliant, and respectful of others than home care children.

It is unclear how program and home children compare on specific social behaviors indicative of altruism, although some writers indicate that program children are more helpful (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983) and cooperative (Rutter, 1982; Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983) with peers and adults than home children. On the other hand, Schenk and Grusec (1987) found that day care children and children who were reared at home, but usually had had some preschool experience, did not differ in their ability to reason through prosocial dilemmas; however, they did differ on their demonstration of actual prosocial behaviors. Children without day care experience were more likely to show prosocial behaviors than children with day care experience.

Some researchers have suggested that altruism is linked to the ability to perspective-take (Radke-Yarrow, Zahn-Waxler, & Chapman,

1983) and to feelings of competence and responsibility (Peterson, 1983). Thus, if through increased social interaction, program children have more systematic opportunity to role-play or to learn about another's point of view, or if they are systematically encouraged to develop social skills which foster feelings of competence, then perhaps children who attend a child program might be expected to show heightened levels of altruistic behavior.

To our knowledge, no one has addressed honesty, a social value, as it relates to an early childhood population. Nonetheless, its societal implications need no explication. Berndt, McCartney, Caparulo, and Moore (1983) examined honesty scores in middle childhood and found that children respond less positively (i.e., more dishonestly) to an honesty dilemma after discussing it with peers than when they are asked to respond to the dilemma without peer corroboration. Thus, in their study, peer corroboration somehow encouraged decisions which were more aligned with self-interest and less honest than those produced by noncollaborative thinking.

It is unclear if Berndt et al.'s (1983) research may be generalized to the preschool years. Piaget (1965) asserted that young children disregarded honesty, or specifically, told lies, as a natural part of egocentric thought, being unable to separate intentions from actions and realism from animism or artificialism. Consonant with Piagetian theory, it seems then that preschool

youngsters, similar to children in middle childhood, would also have difficulties with honesty dilemmas, but not because of peer contagion. Rather, their problems would result due to their age-specific egocentrism implying that these difficulties with honesty dilemmas would occur equally often without, but also with, peer contact. Thus, children in preschool, day care, and home care, regardless of the amount of peer contact, would score similarly when confronted with an honesty dilemma simply because they are assumed to share the same developmental characteristic critical to honesty judgments; namely, egocentrism.

Nonetheless, it is uncertain whether the greater social awareness attributed to program children would then have an effect on their response to an honesty dilemma. Further, since it is assumed that program children have extended participation with peers, it is problematic whether this association would influence children's perceptions of an honesty dilemma.

Finally, since it is assumed that extended social participation and awareness is a strong benefit of being involved in a child program, this study also examined children's civic awareness, a variable, to our knowledge, also not addressed in any other study of young children.

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of entry into a child program, both day care and preschool, on children's honesty, helping, sharing, comforting, and civic awareness scores

and to compare these scores with scores of children who had always been in home care and remained in home care. Our hypothesis was that children, after having been in a child program for several months, would score higher on prosocial behaviors and civic awareness due to their extended social interactions, and lower on the honesty dilemma than home care children because their greater exposure to peers would give them more alternative behaviors. We did not assume that program children would become, in truth, less honest; rather, we believed that lower honesty scores would occur with the program children after extended peer contact simply because this peer contact, as well as other factors specific to child programs, would give the children exposure to peer values and to alternative ways of doing things.

Method

Children in three different child care settings, day care, preschool, and home care, were pre- and post-tested concerning their understanding of helping, sharing, comforting, honesty, and civic awareness, their definitions of helping, sharing, comforting, and honest behaviors, and their judgment of what their behavior would be in situations challenging helping, sharing, comforting, or honesty.

Participants

Preschool

Eighteen children, ten boys and eight girls attending the

university preschool, received parental permission to participate in this study. Their ages ranged from 49 months to 61 months, mean = 55.9 months, sd = 3.9 months. The children were white and lived with both biological parents in intact, two-parent homes. They attended preschool four days a week for 2 1/2 hours each day. For the rest of their day they were cared for by their mother at home. Mothers were not employed outside the home. The children were tested at the preschool within two weeks of their entrance into preschool. They had never attended preschool before this experience.

Family income ranged from $15,000 to over $55,000, mean = $30,000, sd = $9,000. Mother's education level ranged from 12 years of schooling to 20 years, mean = 15.2 years, sd = 2.1 years. Father's education level ranged from 12 years to 20 years, mean = 16.8 years, sd = .653. Preschool families averaged four children per family.

Day Care

Nineteen day care children, eight girls and eleven boys, received parental permission to participate in the study. They ranged in age from 42 months to 60 months, mean = 51.7 months, sd = 4.7 months. All children were white and lived with both biological parents in intact, two-parent homes. They attended day care for a total of 30 to 40 hours a week.

The children came from three day care centers in the area which

were comparable to each other in terms of size, child-caregiver ratio, availability of materials, organization of space, caregiver education, and quality of activities. Four child developmentalists, using the criteria described above, rated the centers as low/medium in quality. The centers all held current licenses issued by the state of Utah.

Initially it had been our intention to involve in the study only those children who had never attended day care before. We wanted to test them immediately upon their entrance into day care with a post-test three months later. After an extensive search of this and contiguous areas, we were only able to find nine children, six boys and three girls, who fit this criteria. Thus, these nine children had never before been in day care and were just entering as they were recruited for the study.

The remaining ten children, five boys and five girls, were returning to the day care center in the fall after being cared for at home by a parent, older sibling, or babysitter during the summer months. All day care children were tested at the day care center within the first two weeks of their entrance or reentrance to day care.

The day care families averaged three children per family. Father's years of education ranged from 12 to 20 years, mean = 15 years, sd = 2.6 years. Mother's years of education ranged from 12 to 18 years, mean = 13.5 years, sd = 2 years. Family income ranged

from $5,000 to $55,000, mean = $25,000, sd = $11,000.

Home Care

Twenty-two home care children, ten girls and twelve boys, ranging in age from 51 months to 62 months, mean = 56.5, sd = 2.9 months, composed the home care group. The home care children were also white and lived with both biological parents in intact, two-parent homes. The home care children were cared for by their mother in their own homes. They had never attended preschool. Mothers did not work outside the home nor had they ever worked outside the home. Furthermore, the amount of time children were left with an alternative caregiver was limited to no more than five hours each week.

The home care families averaged over four siblings per family. Mother's years of education ranged from 12 to 16 years, mean = 12.8, sd = 1.2 years. Father's years of education ranged from 12 to 20 years, mean = 14.6, sd = 2.2 years. Annual family income ranged from $5,000 to $35,000, mean = $17,500, sd = $7,500.

The Duncan Test of Socioeconomic Status was used to determine the socioeconomic level of participants. Scores ranged from 0 = unemployed (many of the participants were students) to 4 = professional. Forty-nine percent of the families were on Level 0, 6% on Level 1, 6% on Level 2, over 12% on Level 3, and 4% for Level 4. Information was missing for 21% of the cases. Analysis of variance indicated no differences between care settings for

classification scores on the Duncan.

Instruments

The helping, sharing, and comforting instruments assessed prosocial behaviors through a projective component as well as through actual observation. For the projective portion, children were introduced through stories and pictures to dilemmas involving children of their own age and gender which specifically encouraged, on the part of the fictional child in the story, the manifestation of either helping, sharing, or comforting behaviors. For each prosocial dilemma, the children were encouraged to articulate how they thought the child in the story would behave. Actual observation of helping, sharing, and comforting behaviors on the part of the target child were accomplished through "real life" dilemmas built into the protocol that will be described later.

While the prosocial behaviors were assessed through actual observation as well as projection, the child's views of honesty were measured through projection only since it was deemed unethical to put the child in a situation that challenged his/her honesty. Civic Awareness was measured by assessing the child's recognition of pictures of government and religious leaders, the American flag, cartoon figures, and so on.

Reliability and Validity: The instruments were piloted on several subsamples of day care, home care and preschool children comparable to the children eventually used for the study. A new

sample was used for each piloting. A panel of five professional child developmentalists individually assessed the items for clarity and their ability to be understood by children of this age. The panel also assessed the instruments for face validity. Test-retest reliability between time 1 and time 2 over a three-month period was $r = .382$ $p \leq .002$.

Two female child development graduate assistants were interviewers for this study. Consistency-reliability of interview techniques was established before the beginning of the study and re-established at mid and end points.

In order to record the child's prosocial behavioral responses, the interviewers made notes on the child's actions and responses through the interview process. In addition, the entire assessment process was tape recorded and coded by two female research assistants who were blind to the child care situation. Interrater reliability was 97.8 or above on all items. Due to the logistics of counterbalancing projective and observational components, the instruments were presented in a fixed order. It took about 45 minutes to administer the entire assessment. Each individual instrument is discussed below. Actual scoring of the instruments is available upon request from the authors.

Helping and Sharing Instrument

To begin the entire procedure, the experimenter told the child, "I am going to be using paper and pencil today while we work. I

will need to write down some things. Here is a pencil and some paper that you can use while I get my things ready. You can just draw a picture if you like." The experimenter then shuffled through papers, obviously looking for something. After a few moments she said, "I lost my pencil. I can't find it, and I need a pencil to write with." If the child did not offer his/her pencil or make verbal reference to the pencil s/he had just been given, the experimenter says to the child, "Would you share your pencil?" Either way, the experimenter then finds his/her pencil so that both experimenter and child begin the session with pencil and paper. Responses for this section were scored according to the following categories:

a - no response or an inappropriate response;

b - going to someone else for aid or making an appropriate verbal response;

c - making an appropriate behavioral response.

The child was then shown a picture of a preschool youngster who had just fallen while riding her tricycle. The experimenter told the child, "Gina could ride her tricycle really fast. But one time she went too fast and she fell and hurt herself. Her brother Paul was watching. What did Paul do when Gina fell?" If the child did not mention a helpful behavior, one was suggested as an outcome. The child was then asked, "What is this called? How did Paul help Gina?"

Then the child was shown two pictures, one which depicted children helping their mother and one which showed children engaged in activity independent of the adult. The child was asked to point to the one which showed helping. They were then asked what being a helper means and what they did to help.

The following story was presented next. Mother and Daddy bought a new tricycle for Sammy and Kelly. They both liked to ride it. But one morning just when Kelly started riding, Sammy came out and told her to get off. What should Sammy do? What should Kelly do?

The child was shown two pictures. One picture depicted sharing and the other showed children engaged in activities independent of each other. They were told, "Here are two pictures. One picture shows sharing. Please point to the picture of sharing for me." If the correct response was made the child was then asked, "What are they sharing?" If a child made an incorrect response they were told which picture depicted sharing and then asked, "What are they sharing?" Then the experimenter asked, "What does it mean to share? What do you share?"

Next the experimenter said, "We did some hard work. And you listened to my stories so well. Thank you for being such a good helper for me today. I think I need a drink of water. Would you like a drink of water, too?" The experimenter poured the water into two glasses but twice spilled some. A cloth was placed at the

side of the table within full view of the child and within the child's reach. The child's response to the two spills was noted and scored as to whether or not the child helped or offered to help the adult, or commented in some way about the spill.

Civic Awareness Instrument

The children were then told, "I have some pictures of people and things that I am going to show you now. I will ask you to tell me about the pictures." The pictures were in black and white on white sheets of paper 8 1/2 inches by 11 inches. The focal parts or content of the pictures all filled approximately the same amount of space on the paper. The children were shown pictures of the following individuals and things in the order given: George Washington, Pope John Paul II, the Statue of Liberty, Abraham Lincoln, the dominant religious leader in the state, the American flag, the President of the United States, the governor of the state, Spiderman, and Han Solo and Chewbacca.

The children were asked to identify the person or object in the picture and then asked to tell what the person did or the object "stood for." If they could not identify the person or object they were told what it was and then asked what they did or stood for.

In order to obtain full points on an item the children needed to give an exact response when asked for name and activity. For example, when asked about George Washington, no response or an incorrect answer such as saying that "George Washington was the

principal of their brother's school" was given no points. If they responded that "he cut down the cherry tree" or was "the man on the dollar bill" they received 1 point. They were awarded two points if they said the picture was of George Washington or of the "Father of our Country" or of our first president.

When asked about the person's activity or the object's purpose they were not given any points if they gave an incorrect response or no response at all. They received one point if, in the case of Pope John Paul II, they responded that he is a "church person" and two points if they said he is the Pope or the leader of the Catholic Church.

Comforting Instrument

The comforting section began by showing the child a doll in its cradle. The child was told, "This is a baby doll in its cradle. Sometimes babies are unhappy and cry. If you were alone with a real baby and it started to cry, what would you do?"

If the child needed clarification at that point s/he was told, "Show me what you would do by pretending this doll is a real baby." It is important to realize that whenever the child needed clarification or a prompt they were not penalized for this.

The child's response, as well as all other responses in this section, was scored according to the following categories:

a - saying they did not know what to do

b - saying they would ignore the baby

c - indicating they would seek help from another source, such as saying, "I'd go get my Mommy"

d - indicating the use of a comforting verbal expression; i.e., "I'd sing to the baby"

e - indicating the use of a comforting physical expression; i.e., "I'd rock it in a chair", "I'd kiss it", etc.

The child was then told, "Sometimes grownups are sad too. If I hurt my elbow and was feeling very sad, what would you do?"

Then the child was shown a picture of a youngster the same age and gender. The child was asked, "Do you ever feel sad or lonely? If this child were feeling lonely and were crying what would you do?"

The next picture was one of a child crying in an overturned wagon. The interviewer said, "Kim was riding in the wagon when it was going too fast. The wagon tipped over and Kim fell out. If you saw this happen to Kim, what would you do?" If the child made no response s/he was prompted with, "What would you do for Kim?"

The child was shown a picture of a dog who appeared to be hurt. The child was told, "This child and his/her dog were playing. The dog ran into the street and was hit by a car. The dog is really hurt and the child is upset. If you saw this happen to the dog and the child, what would you do?" If no response is given, s/he was prompted with, "What would you do for the child?"

The child was shown a picture of a boy about the same age as

the subject who looked sad. The child was told, "Kevin is feeling lonely and sad. Kevin says, 'The rest of the children don't want to play with me.' If you saw Kevin like this, what would you do?" The prompt, if needed, was, "What would you do for Kevin?"

Honesty Instrument

The child was invited to listen to a story about two puppets and some cookies. The child was shown both the puppets and a plate of cookies and told that they could have a cookie after the discussion if they would like. The experimenter said, "I want to tell you a story about some puppets and some cookies. The puppets were brother and sister and their mother had just made some yummy, juicy, chocolate chip cookies. Mmmm, didn't they smell good? The mother told the puppets that they could each have one, but only one, cookie. Then she went out of the room. The puppets weren't to have any more. They looked at the cookies. Oh, they looked so good! They wanted just one more. What would you do if your mother had just made some cookies and you wanted just one more? Well, the puppets took two chocolate chip cookies. Should they have taken one more cookie after their mother told them they could only have one? Then their mother came back. What would you tell your mother if you were one of the puppets? They said they did not take another cookie. Should they have done that? What would you do?"

The entire process of experimenter queries and child responses was tape recorded and coded afterwards by two female research

assistants who were blind to the child care situation. Interrater reliability was 97.8 on all items.

Results

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Pearson Correlation Coefficients were computed for the relationships between helping/sharing, civic awareness, honesty, and comforting pre and post tests, the number of siblings the child had, father's education, mother's education, family income, the child's age, and reported church activity and monthly church attendance. See Tables 1 and 2 for correlations between dependent measures and demographic variables.

Analysis of Covariance

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was run to assess for heterogeneity of slopes between day care, home care, and preschool cells. This measure was nonsignificant for all assessments including those for helping, sharing, comforting, honesty, and civic awareness. Thus, the slopes for every social competence measure for all child care settings were similar.

A 2 (sex) X 3 (care setting) univariate analysis of covariance was run separately for each social competence post test (helping and sharing, comforting, honesty, and civic awareness) using age and the child's score on the appropriate social competence pretest as covariables.

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and range of

scores for all measures by the main effect of care setting. Table 4 presents the R^2 and the significance levels of ANCOVA F tests for the four dependent variables of helping/sharing, comforting, honesty, and civic awareness.

Helping and Sharing Measure

Neither main effects nor interactions were significant.

Comforting Measure

Neither main effects nor interactions were significant.

Overall Measure of Prosocial Awareness

The helping, sharing, and comforting scores were then combined for one overall measure of prosocial behavior. Using the model described above, the three groups did not differ on overall prosocial scores.

Honesty Measure

Neither main effects nor interactions were significant.

Civic Awareness Measure

The main effect of care setting was significant ($F = 7.4551$, 2,49 df, $p < .001$). Pairwise tests of least significant differences indicated that children in preschool had higher civic awareness scores (mean, standard deviation = 19.5112, 1.4607) than children in day care (14.3547, 1.535) or children in home care (12.4789, 1.1908). The main effect of gender and the interaction of gender and care were not significant.

Civic awareness data were subdivided and analyzed by a 2

(gender) X 3 (care setting) ANCOVA (with age and pretest as covariates) to determine differences between children on awareness of (1) national symbols, i.e., the Statue of Liberty, the American Flag; (2) government figures, i.e., the governor of the state, the President of the United States; (3) historical figures, i.e., George Washington, Abraham Lincoln; (4) religious figures, i.e., Pope John Paul II, Mormon Church President Spencer W. Kimball (head of the dominant religion in the state); and (5) fictional characters, i.e., Spiderman, Star Wars figures.

Because of the exploratory nature of these data, significance levels were set at .10. For recognition of national symbols, $F = 2.4838$, 2,49 df, $p < .09$. Test of least significant differences indicated that means for preschool children were significantly different from those for day care children (preschool = 5.608 [.5786]; day care = 3.7375 [.6076]; and home care = 4.410 [.4714]).

For recognition of government figures, $F = 2.5936$, 2,49 df, $p < .09$. Test of least significant differences indicated that means for preschool children were significantly different from those for home care children (preschool = 1.2719 [.3593]; day care = .7264 [.3767]; home care = .2485 [.2922]).

Regarding recognition of historical figures, $F = 2.6213$, 2,49 df, $p < .08$). Tests of least significant differences indicated that means for preschool children were significantly different from home care means (preschool = 3.2560 [.7654]; day care = 1.8373

[.8174]; home care = 1.0593 [.6293]).

For recognition of religious figures the main effect of care was significant ($F = 2.467$, 2,49 df, $p < .10$). Tests of least significant differences indicated that preschool children could identify significantly more religious figures than home care children (preschool = 2.5405, [.4640]; day care = 2.2014, [.5137]; home care = 1.234, [.4010]). The interaction of care and gender was also significant ($F = 3.4046$, 2,49 df, $p > .04$) with tests of least significant differences indicating that preschool boys and day care girls were more likely to identify state and world religious figures than any other gender X care combination (see Figure 1).

The three groups did not differ regarding recognition of fictional characters ($F = 1.8364$, 2,49 df, $p < .17$). See Tables 5 and 6 for a summary of significance levels and means and standard deviations.

Discussion

The data clearly indicate that participation in a high quality child program expands a child's awareness of the world. This study also suggests, however, that some knowledge, in this case knowledge of cartoon and film figures, appears to be part of the culture of childhood and thus accessed widely and held commonly by most children regardless of their participation in a child program.

The data also indicate that alternative and supplemental

childrearing experiences do not necessarily impact children's prosocial values and their notions of honesty. Using Peterson's model, perhaps three months is not sufficient time to see changes in internal rule structures governing altruistic behavior. On the other hand, perhaps internal rules are affected most directly by experiences within rather than outside the home. Extended care experience may reinforce and solidify family values or it may create dissonance between the values taught in the home and the child program, but it is likely that for the young child, values found in extended care do not supersede or replace home values. So far, we have implied that values may differ between child programs and home environment. In reality, since it is culturally facilitative to have empathic, altruistic, honest citizens, it is unlikely that home and center values would differ dramatically, if at all. Deviations might be found on an informal level manifest interpersonally between peers or between caregiver and child, particularly if there were a paucity of resources or personnel in the program, but values formally espoused at home and in the child program probably represent highly similar variations on the same theme.

Rheingold (1982) has indicated that young children's prosocial behaviors develop very early and are clearly manifest at least by 30 months if not much younger. If the same developmental trajectory could be assumed for this study, our participants had formulated already a sense of sharing, helping, and comforting

prior to the inception of the study which was affected only tangentially by their participation in preschool or in a day care program.

Regarding the honesty measure, these data support modifications to Piaget's notion of childhood egocentrism. Piaget suggested that children may be unable to make distinctions between honesty and dishonesty due to their egocentrism, but in this study, that was not the case. The fact that most participants, independent of care situation, were able to make accurate judgments of honesty suggests that honesty, like helping, sharing, and comforting, is reflective of family values and affected very little by experience in ancillary programs. However, it is true that three months is a very short period of time for change to take place, so perhaps extended program participation could predict differences in honesty and prosocial scores later on. We suggest, however, that honesty, helping, sharing, and comforting are core values which are nurtured most saliently by the home. Other experiences may alter their manifestation somewhat, but their ultimate expression remains constant.

We should note, however, that our measures, while including some behavioral elements, assess values mostly at the cognitive level. They can not be considered true measures of actual behavior. An exception is the civic awareness data which are, in fact, true behavioral measures since they assess the child's true

knowledge of the world. Nonetheless, all children were tested in the same way and thus data are accurate reflections of cognitive awareness and perception across three distinct groups of children.

It is important to realize that all three groups of children were in stable home environments with both mother and father present. The educational level of the parents was high with family size relatively large. The groups were furthermore homogeneous in terms of race, national origin, religion, lifestyle, and living conditions. While these factors may restrict the application of findings to other populations, they provide significant control for measurement and data quality.

References

Belsky, J., & Steinberg, L.D. (1978). The effects of day care: A critical review. Child Development, 49, 929-949.

Berndt, T.J., McCartney, K., Caparulo, B.K. & Moore, A.M. (1983-84). Social Cognition, 2, 343-359.

Clarke-Stewart, A.K. & Fein, G.G. (1983). Early Childhood Programs. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology (2nd ed.) (pp. 917-999). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Duncan Socio-Economic Index. (1978). Evaluation of the process of mainstreaming handicapped children into project Head Start Phase II. Interim report, Applied Management Sciences, Inc. Silver Spring, MD: Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

Peterson, L. (1982). Altruism and the development of internal control: An integrative model. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 28, 197-222.

Peterson, L. (1983). Influence of age, task competence, and responsibility focus on children's altruism. Developmental Psychology, 19, 141-148.

Piaget, J. (1965). The Moral Development of the Child. New York: The Free Press.

Radke-Yarrow, M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Chapman, M. (1983). Children's prosocial dispositions and behavior. In P.H. Mussen (ed.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 4. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rheingold, H. (1982). Little children's participation in the work of adults, a nascent prosocial behavior. Child Development, 53, 114-125.

Rutter, M. (1982). Social-emotional consequences of day care for preschool children. In E.F. Zigler & E.W. Gordon (eds.), Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues. Boston: Auburn House.

Schenk, V.M. & Grusec, J.E. (1987). A comparison of prosocial behavior of children with and without day care experience. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 33, 231-240.

Table 1

Correlations between Pretests, Post Tests, and Demographic Variables

	Civic Pretest	Civic Post Test	Comforting Pretest	Comforting Post Test	Honesty Pretest	Honesty Post Test	Help Pretest	Help Post Test
Civic Pretest		.60 p=.000	.09 p=.25	.25 p=.03	.26 p=.02	.33 p=.006	.42 p=.001	.42 p=.001
Civic Post Test	.60 p=.000		.38 p=.002	.43 p=.000	.22 p=.05	.41 p=.001	.32 p=.008	.44 p=.000
Comfort Pretest	.09 p=.25	.38 p=.002		.62 p=.000	.05 p=.36	.37 p=.002	.38 p=.002	.33 p=.006
Comfort Post Test	.25 p=.03	.43 p=.000	.62 p=.000		.29 p=.02	.64 p=.000	.38 p=.002	.61 p=.000
Honesty Pretest	.28 p=.02	.23 p=.05	.05 p=.36	.29 p=.02		.43 p=.000	.26 p=.03	.27 p=.02
Honesty Post Test	.33 p=.006	.41 p=.001	.37 p=.002	.64 p=.000	.43 p=.000		.25 p=.03	.65 p=.000
Help Pretest	.42 p=.001	.32 p=.008	.38 p=.002	.38 p=.002	.26 p=.03	.25 p=.03		.44 p=.000
Help Post Test	.42 p=.001	.44 p=.000	.33 p=.006	.61 p=.000	.26 p=.02	.65 p=.000	.44 p=.000	
Age	.39 p=.001	.30 p=.02	.01 p=.46	.11 p=.20	.20 p=.06	.23 p=.04	.21 p=.06	.18 p=10
# of Siblings	.004 p=.49	-.10 p=.25	-.29 p=.02	-.10 p=.24	.14 p=.17	-.02 p=.46	.29 p=.02	.24 p=.05
Mother's Education	.06 p=.34	.16 p=.13	-.03 p=.42	-.07 p=.32	-.07 p=.32	.00 p=.49	.05 p=.37	.11 p=.22

(table continues)

(Table 1 continued)

	Civic Pretest	Civic Post Test	Comforting Pretest	Comforting Post Test	Honesty Pretest	Honesty Post Test	Help Pretest	Help Post Test
Father's Education	.19 p=.10	.06 p=.35	.05 p=.37	.06 p=.34	-.02 p=.45	.04 p=.39	.27 p=.03	.27 p=.03
Family Income	.13 p=.18	.27 p=.03	.09 p=.26	.19 p=.10	-.03 p=.41	.04 p=.39	.05 p=.38	.05 p=.38
Family Religiosity	.12 p=.21	-.04 p=.39	-.22 p=.06	-.09 p=.26	.18 p=.10	.00 p=.50	.23 p=.06	.25 p=.04
Monthly Church Attendance	.10 p=.24	-.07 p=.32	-.04 p=.38	.08 p=.28	.15 p=.14	.14 p=.17	.34 p=.009	.33 p=.01

Table 2

Correlation and Significance Levels for Demographic Variables

	Child's Age	Number of Siblings	Mother's Education	Father's Education	Family Income	Family Religi-osity	Monthly Religious Attendance
Child's Age		.12 p=.20	-.17 p=.12	-.09 p=.27	-.15 p=.15	.35 p=.006	.33 p=.008
Number of Siblings			.15 p=.15	.05 p=.36	-.01 p=.46	.59 p=.000	.47 p=.000
Mother's Education				.51 p=.000	.24 p=.05	.15 p=.14	.30 p=.02
Father's Education					.51 p=.000	.05 p=.37	.14 p=.16
Family Income						-.16 p=.13	-.15 p=.16
Religiosity							.74 p=.000
Monthly Attendance							

Table 3

Means (Standard Deviations) for the Four Dependent Variables by Care Setting

Care Setting	N	Helping/ Sharing (0-30)[b]	Comforting (0-42)	Honesty (0-10)	Civic Awareness (0-88)
Preschool	16	19.1490[a] (1.3085)	31.0315[a] (2.0859)	7.4273[a] (.5252)	19.5112 (1.4607)
Day Care	17	18.2344[a] (1.3876)	31.4342[a] (2.1954)	6.9029[a] (.5472)	14.3547[a] (1.5348)
Home Care	24	18.7871[a] (1.0893)	30.8403[a] (1.7002)	7.0762[a] (.4268)	12.4789[a] (1.1908)

[a] Means in a given column, which share the same superscript, are not significantly different from each other.

[b] Values in parentheses indicate the theoretical range of scores, from lowest to highest possible score, for that dependent measure.

Table 4

R^2 and Significance Levels of ANCOVA F Tests for the Four Dependent Variables

ANCOVA Model	DF	Helping/ Sharing	Comforting	Honesty	Civic Awareness
Source					
Age	1	.594	.366	.440	.862
Pretest Score	1	.002	.000	.005	.000
Care Setting	2	.899	.980	.786	.001
Gender	1	.967	.287	.978	.405
Care X Gender	2	.253	.614	.800	.143
R^2		.250	.421	.217	.538

Table 5

Significant Levels and R^2 for the Subcategories of Civic Awareness by Care Setting

	National Symbols	Government Figures	Historical Figures	Religious Figures	Fictional Characters
Age	.79	.72	.16	.07	.20
Pretest	.000	.000	.01	.000	.17
Care Setting	.09	.09	.08	.10	.29
Gender	.14	.63	.98	.04	.87
R^2	.43	.40	.27	.51	.35

Table 6

Means (and Standard Deviations) for the Subcategories of Civic Awareness by Care Setting

	National Symbols	Government Figures	Historical Figures	Religious Figures	Fictional Characters
Preschool	5.608 (.579)	1.272 (.3593)	3.260 (.765)	2.540 (.464)	6.842 (.632)
Day Care	3.738 (.608)	.726 (.377)	1.837 (.817)	2.201 (.514)	6.200 (.674)
Home Care	4.410 (.471)	.249 (.292)	1.059 (.629)	1.234 (.401)	5.333 (.519)

a - Means with the same subscript in a given column do not differ from each other at a probability level less than .10.